DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 556 RC 004 619

AUTHOR Kleibrink, Michael C.; And Others
TITLE Value Orientations of Retrained-Relocated Workers: A Study of Rural Urban Adjustment.
INSTITUTION Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, College Station.
PUB DATE Aug 70
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society Meeting (Washington, D.C., August 1970)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.95
DESCRIPTORS Achievement, *Aerospace Industry, Behavioral Science Research, Employees, Goal Orientation, *Job Training, *Mexican Americans, Migrant Employment, Relocation, *Rural Urban Differences, *Values
IDENTIFIERS Texas

ABSTRACT

In the attempt to develop means for underemployed workers to increase their level of economic success, 684 south Texans (mostly Mexican Americans) were retrained for aircraft assembly and then relocated in the Dallas vicinity. Some 46 relocated workers were interviewed 1 month after their relocation in order to ascertain adjustment patterns resulting from moving to the more dominant American cultural system. Those who remained in the program were interviewed again at 6, 12, and 18 months after relocation. In addition, 6 returnees were interviewed in south Texas. The analysis attempts to show the relation of successful rural-urban migration to achievement as a primary value orientation. Findings suggest that importance of family is significantly related to failure in a relocation program. On the other hand, achievement orientations are slightly more important to stayers than to returnees. Measures of delay of gratification used give only slight support to the achievement model. The authors conclude that the theoretical framework used is valid but that better measures of values are needed for a predictive model. The analysis points to an important use of the value framework in the study of migration. (Author/AL)

ED042556

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

RECEIVED
AUG 31 1970
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

VALUE ORIENTATIONS OF RETRAINED-RELOCATED WORKERS: A STUDY OF RURAL URBAN ADJUSTMENT*

Michael C. Kleibrink, David C. Ruesink and E. Leonard Copeland
Texas A&M University

ABSTRACT

In the attempt to develop means for underemployed workers to increase their level of economic success, 684 South Texans (mostly Mexican-Americans) were retrained for aircraft assembly then relocated about 500 miles north to the Dallas vicinity. A sample of 46 relocated workers were interviewed at one month after their relocation in order to understand adjustment patterns resulting from moving to the more dominant American cultural system. Those who remained in the program were interviewed again at six, twelve, and eighteen months after relocation. In addition, six returnees were interviewed in south Texas.

The analysis attempts to show the relation of successful rural-urban migration to achievement as a primary value orientation. The findings suggest that importance of family is significantly related to failure in a relocation program. On the other hand, achievement orientations are slightly more important to stayers than returnees. The measures of delay of gratification used give only slight support to the achievement model.

The authors conclude that the theoretical framework used is valid, but better measures of values are needed for a predictive model. The analysis points to an important use of the value framework in the study of migration.

RC004619

*A paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society Meeting, Washington, D.C. August, 1970. The development of this report was supported by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station and the Cooperative State Research Service Project G - 1716.

Value Orientations of Retrained-Relocated Workers: A Study of Rural-Urban Adjustment

Economic development seldom occurs uniformly throughout a nation. Consequently, many parts of the United States such as the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas have pockets of poverty characterized by high unemployment rates while other areas of the same state enjoy a relatively high level of living with extremely low unemployment rates. Tensions between these two types of areas create a pulling force on the labor supply of the underdeveloped areas. Historically, areas of relatively high economic growth have experienced a net inflow of people. It is generally assumed that people are attracted by economic opportunities in the demand area (Rutman, 1970).

Indeed, rural migrants have been found to be upwardly mobile (Bock and Iutaka, 1969) in spite of the fact that they enter the urban labor market at lower positions and stay in lower positions relative to other urban residents (Shannon and Lettan, 1963) yet not all migrants remain in the urban center even though they are increasing their status. Many migrants return to their original homes giving up the prospects of economic success.

Two conflicting theories exist explaining the adjustment process of migrants. Both theories revolve around the criteria which are used by the individual in the selection among modes, means and ends of action (values). McClelland (1961) suggests that an orientation toward achievement has led to economic success of individuals and societies alike. Furthermore, Navaho migrants who have goal structures compatible with urban opportunities have been found by Graves and Van Arsdale (1966) to be more likely to remain in the metropolitan center of Denver. However, in the theoretical analysis of value orientations Parsons (1951) contrasts the achievement orientation with ascriptive orientation. The latter orientation centers on security of social rather

than economic goals. Thus one would expect the achievement orientation to conflict with a strong extended family structure. Indeed, parents who espouse nuclear rather than extended family norms with respect to intergenerational relationships seem less likely to see conflict between family values and economic success values (Johnson and Kerckhoff, 1964). Furthermore, Killian (1953) suggests that a strong family orientation impedes assimilation into the urban structure. However, the extended family has been shown to play an important role in the urban adjustment of Kentucky mountain migrants (Moss, 1956; Brown and Schwarzweller, 1963; and Schwarzweller and Seggar, 1967). On the other hand, Graves and Van Arsdale (1966) were unable to show that successful Navaho migrants espoused social love and affection goals less often than migrants who returned to the reservation.

A basic conflict appears throughout research literature, theoretical as well as empirical, of value orientations. One group of researhcers maintain that economic success is a dominant value throughout our country (Merton, 1968) while the other (Hyman, 1963) maintain that it is merely a middle class value. Empirically, one group maintains that family orientations take precedence over achievement orientations while another group supports the opposite view. This conflict becomes intensified as our society increases in complexity forcing government officials to activate policies for reallocating manpower. We can no longer assume that man can control his own destiny. Many Americans whose jobs are destroyed by technology or who are just entering into the labor market do not posses skills or resources to get jobs which would allow them to hold jobs equivalent to members of the society who happen to find themselves in a more prosperous area.

In order to facilitate social mobility among certain depressed groups, several attempts have been made to aid people in relocating from areas with high underemployment rates (supply areas) to areas where more opportunities

exist (demand areas). In some cases, reallocation of labor also involves retraining the workers to fill a job different from any that they have ever done. The purpose of this paper is to analyze data on certain aspects of the value orientations of one group of retained and relocated South Texans.

Methods and Procedures

On October 7, 1967, and each week for the next 52 weeks, classes of fifteen South Texans began a four-week training program in the Lower Rio Grande Valley to become aircraft assemblers. Training was conducted at one of three centers located in Harlingen, McAllen, and Rio Grande City by instructors from Vought Aeronautics Division of Ling-Temco-Vought Corporation (LTV). Upon successful completion of the training, 684 workers and their families were relocated in the Dallas-Fort Worth area to begin industrial work for Ling-Temco-Vought in Grand Prairie, Texas. At the beginning of June over half (55%) of the relocated workers were still employed with LTV. This was thirty two months after the program was begun and twenty one months after the last class had moved from South Texas to Grand Prairie.

All of those who were relocated in May of 1968 were selected for follow-up interviews which were begun one month after their relocation and taken every six months thereafter for two years. Forty six men were interviewed in June and July of 1968, 32 of which were still working for LTV as of June 1, 1970. Data for this paper will be taken from information gathered on these 46 people at various six month intervals. The one, six, twelve, and eighteen month data will be used for this analysis; however, difficulty in locating the addresses of relocated workers prevented interviewing all respondents. In addition, six men were interviewed in South Texas after they had returned there to live. Information from these interviews will be used for a more rigid comparison of

adjusters (Stayers) and those who return to the supply area (Returnees).

For the most part only percentages will be used in this analysis; however, where rank order scales are used a student's test for difference in the mean will be run. Where applicable the level of confidence will be set at the .05 level.

Framework

The framework to be used in this analysis will be part of the pattern variable scheme presented by Parsons (1951). The universal-achievement combination of value orientations contrasted with the particularistic ascriptive pattern scheme provides a means for predicting successful rural-urban migration. Parsons (1951: 199) suggests that the difference in these two pattern types constitutes the basic difference between the Mexican-American subculture and the greater American society. Since 90% of the relocated workers in this project were Mexican-Americans who moved into a predominantly Anglo urban center, the scheme becomes even more relevant.

> It seems logical to infer that, in general, those people operating in reference to the particularistic-ascriptive value set will not be as desirous of social achievement as others identifying with the opposed value pattern. Those that do desire social achievement will not be as inclined to seek it through occupational advancement, which is largely regulated by universalistic criteria (i.e. education and length of experience) (Kuvlesky and Patella, 1970).

Goal Orientations

While values cannot be taken directly from the goals that an individual chooses, they can be crudely inferred from goals where they are clearly set forth by the respondent. Goals which can be assumed to indicate general trends of orientation for this analysis can be broken down into two types. One goal type can be described as the achievement goal type which includes

both economic achievement and status achievement. The second goal type emphasizes the importance of ascriptive social goals or an individual orientation opposed to a social one.

Thirty one subjects were asked to rank the seven goal items presented in Table 1.[1] Twenty five (S) were interviewed in the new area eighteen months after relocation while six (R) were interviewed in the supply area after leaving the program and returning to their home in South Texas

Table 1. Mean Ranks of Goal Items for Stayer and Returner Groups of Relocated Workers

	S (29) 18 mo	R (6) 18 mo	t
1. To earn as much money as I can	3.96	4.67	NS
2. To have the kind of house, car, furniture, and other things like this I want	3.92	4.50	NS
3. To get the job I want most	2.48	2.33	NS
4. To get all the education I want	3.44	3.00	NS
5. To live in the kind of community I like best	4.84	4.83	NS
6. To raise a family	3.00	1.67	3.05 $p<.05$
7. To have lots of free time to do what I want	6.36	7.00	NS

* The lower score shows a higher perceived importance by the respondents

The first goal item is directly related with the desire for economic success. Our predictive model would suggest that such a goal preference would be

[1]The scale used was adapted from a study of status orientations of rural youth being conducted by Dr. W. P. Kuvlesky, but has a rather extensive background. For the historical development of the scale, see Reissman (1953), Dynes (1956), Fliegel (1959), and Kuvlesky and Bealer (1966).

highly related to the achievement orientation pattern. We expect, then, to find stayers more likely to rate this item more importantly than those who return. While such was the case, the difference in the mean scores of the two groups was not significant. There is, however, a relatively large difference in the mean ranks. Likewise the second item relating to material status items failed to show a significant difference even though that difference was in the right direction.

The third item relates to a broader aspect of achievement, namely occupational achievement. The achievement-oriented migrant should be more concerned about getting the job he wants most than the non-achiever. However, for our sample this does not appear to be the case because the returnees placed slightly more emphasis on the job of ones choice than did successful migrants. It may be that the returnee group is experiencing more of what Merton (1968) calls goal blockage than the stayer group. At any rate, this item was ranked quite highly by all participants.

The fourth item on the seven unit ranking scale takes a double dimension. Education in the American society holds a great deal of status in itself. Like occupational orientations, education is assumed to show achievement. However, education also shows a value for delayed gratification which clusters with the achievement pattern. Education (formal schooling, that is) should not only have a high status for the achiever, but should also receive a good bit of attention because of its delay component. Again, however, this data failed to confirm our expectations. Returnees ranked education lower (therefore on a higher status level) than did stayers. Again we may find a universal goal pattern, but there may also be a bias because the subjects were aware that the interviewers were from an educational institution.

The fifth item on the scale was originally intended to be a social goal

item showing an ascriptive orientation, but the authors realize that a community may also have status potential for the achiever. The data confirm this confusion as both groups ranked the items almost identically.

The next item fits the ascriptive pattern or the antithesis of the achiever. A migrant who makes goal choices based on the fixed familial relations is not thought to be concerned a great deal with achieving economic success. Likewise, the migrant who places a high value on the family as a goal would be least expected to suffer through urban adjustment. The data confirm our beliefs beyond the significant level normally accepted (.05).

The last item is difficult to relate to this analysis and was also least important for both groups. We will, therefore, not attempt to discuss the free time item.

The data in Table 1 have several general limitations which should be noted. First of all, the sample sizes were so small that any statistical significance can be questioned. Furthermore the data were not obtained prior to the migrants relocation so we really are in no position to call this a predictive model. Finally, we are inferring criteria for selection of goals from the actual goals. A more thorough analysis would be possible if we had asked the respondents to rank the actual criteria. Indeed this scale could be greatly improved, however, there is reason to believe that the general framework has s some validity.

Residential Orientations

Closely alligned with the relocatees' value orientations are the criteria used in their selection of a place to live. Following the achievement paradigm hypothesized earlier, the authors expect successful migrants to select status reasons rather than social reasons for desiring one place to live over another.

Thus when forced to select between being close to work and being near other Spanish speaking people the achievement oriented individual should prefer the former.

As expected, successful migrants rank closeness to work as being more important in choosing a neighborhood, yet, of those who later terminated, 100% ranked being close to work as the primary criteria of the two forced alternatives (Table 2). Terminals left LTV but may have remained in Grand Prairie.

Table 2. Percent Distribution of Criteria for Selection of a Place to Live

	Stayers (27)	Terminals (6)
Living close to work	89	100
Living close to Spanish speaking people	9	-

Also in the 12 month interview, respondents were asked to rank four criteria for selecting a place to live. Three of the items relate to status orientations while the fourth is directed more toward social returns.

We would expect the achievers to be more concerned with the three status items than non-achievers and that they should be less concerned with social items than the latter group. The second portion of our postulate held true though not significantly. Terminals placed more importance on the neighborhood than did the stayers. However, they also placed greater value on monthly cost of housing and closeness to work than did the terminals (again at a level not significant). Closeness to work could be assumed from the above data to be a universal orientation for this group of relocated workers while monthly cost of housing may relate inversely to achievement through the status of the housing.

Achievers may not seek to economize by investing their funds in status objects while non-achievers being less concerned for status may wish to economize on housing for more immediately gratifying goals. This seems to be emphasized by the significant difference in stayers and terminals on the ranking of the importance of having a house. The stayers obviously see the relocation as a long range investment rather than an immediate one (Table 3).

Table 3. Mean Ranks of Residential Orientation 12 months after Relocations for Stayers and Terminals*

	S (24)	T (5)	T
Importance of having a house	2.20	3.60	3.88 $p<.05$
Closeness to work	2.25	2.00	NS
Monthly cost of housing	2.67	2.20	NS
The neighborhood	2.87	2.20	NS

*Terminals left program during second year.

Delay of Gratification

The general achievement orientation calls for a more subtle tendency than those previously analyzed. As noted above, achievement often comes from wise investment rather than immediate spending.

Earlier we raised a question about unexpected lower ranking of education by returnees among the seven goal items. We now turn to more indirect measures for tapping the relocatee's orientation toward delayed gratification through education. At each of the interview periods respondents were asked if they planned to enter other adult or night school courses. The majority of both

groups, as expected with the general orientation toward education, said at the end of the first month that they planned to take additional educational courses. However, the difference in the percentages points in favor of our suggestion that stayers would be more oriented toward future education. On the assumption that stability over time yeilds a higher intensity (Dunsavage and Kleibrink, 1970), we looked at the percentages for the stayer group at each of the interview periods. Contrary to our hypothesis, the general desire for more education steadily declines over time (Table 4.)

Table 4. Percent Distribution of Terminals (one month) and Stayers (1, 6, 12, and 18 months) by Plans for Future Education

	Terminals	Stayers			
	1 month (13)	1 month (29)	6 months (29)	12 months (26)	18 months (23)
Plan to get more education	77	90	62	54	52
Do not plan to get more education	23	10	38	46	48

A number of suggestions migh explain the lowering of educational plans. The workers may simply be discovering the real possibilities of getting more education. Furthrmore, many respondents have noted that increased training doesn't always yeild an increased status. These are only possible explanations, however, and will not be tested here.

We can note the specificity of educational goals, though. A very high percentage of the terminal group at 6 months indicated that they were satisfied with their present educational status when asked what they would prefer. Here we see desire distinguished from actual plans. Terminals who indicated

aspirations for further education were, furthermore, unable to specify the direction of their orientations. A large proportion of stayers, on the other hand, indicate specific desires (Table 5). The stayer group also appeared to be raising their educational goals while directing it away from a particularistic orientation of trade school work (which usually is that sponsored by LTV).

Table 5. Percent Distribution of Terminals (6 month) and Stayers by Educational Plans at 6 and 18 months after Relocation

Educational Aspiration	Terminals 6 months (8)	Stayers 6 months (24)	Stayers 18 months (21)
None	38	4	10
Undefined	62	50	38
High School	0	17	19
Trade School	0	21	14
College	0	8	19

Delay of gratification can also be tapped through economic orientation. One would expect that stayers would be more economically oriented and therefore more likely to save for the future. However, when the data are analyzed we find little difference in those who save among stayers and terminals during the first six months (Table 6). The stayers do, however, show a tendency to open savings accounts after they have settled into the new area.

Borrowing money might also be conceived of as an indicator of delay of gratification. As expected, a slightly higher proportion of the terminal group borrowed during the first six months (Table 7). Those who stayed were more likely to borrow money as their length of residence in the demand area

Table 6. Percent Distribution of Migrants Having a Savings Account in Demand Area: Terminals and Stayers (after 1, 6, and 18 months in the new area)

Type of Savings	Terminals 1 month (12)	Stayers 1 month (23)	Stayers 6 months (26)	Stayers 18 months (21)
None	50	48	38	23
Commercial Bank	25	26	34	10
Sayings and Loan	0	.17	12	5
Company Credit Union	25	.09	12	52
Savings Bonds	0	0	4	10

increased. This may indicate a greater efficiency on the part of the stayer group. They are able to delay borrowing until an understanding of life in the demand area is reached.

Table 7. Percent Distribution of Terminals (6 months) and Stayers (6, 12, and 18 months) Who Borrowed Money While in the Demand Area

	Terminals 6 months (7)	Stayers 6 months (30)	Stayers 12 months (27)	Stayers 18 months (24)
Borrowed	57	43	70	79
Did not borrow	43	57	30	21

The final means of viewing the achievement orientation through delay of gratification is the social orientation of the migrant. We pointed out earlier that achievers would be expected to be less oriented toward social returns than terminals. Since it is about 500 miles from the supply area to the demand area,

the cost of going back to the supply area for frequent visits would seem to force stayers into a less frequent pattern of visiting South Texas.

As expected, more stayers than terminals after one month had not returned to their old home (Table 8). Indeed, some of the stayer group reported that after 18 months on the job they never visit their old home. However, most respondents indicated that they had visited the supply area once every 3 or 4 months. Many in this group noted that they returned to South Texas mostly on holidays as do most Americans.

Table 8. Percent Distribution of Terminals (1 month) and Stayers (1 and 18 months) by Frequency of Visits to the Supply Area

Frequency of Visits	Terminals 1 month (13)	Stayers 1 month (26)	Stayers 18 months (18)
Never	54	69	11
Less than 3 times per year	0	0	11
Once every 3 to 4 months	8	4	76
Once every 1 or 2 months	38	27	22
More than once per month	0	0	0

Conclusion

In this analysis we have attempted to test the validity of one type of value orientation as a predictive model for rural-urban adjustment. In spite of the logical association of the achievement value pattern to successful rural-urban migration, we were able to predict within the accepted level of confidence only with two of the empirical goal orientations presented. Dominance of concern for their family was significantly more important to returnees

than stayers while among residential orientations the importance of having a house instead of some other form of housing arrangements was significantly more important to stayers than terminals. Most of the variables follow the hypothesized trend but are not significantly different for stayers and terminals. Of the four achievement directed goals -- job, education, money, and material items -- only the orientation toward education was in the wrong direction. Likewise, the community element used in the addition to the family orientation as indicators of an ascriptive pattern was in the predicted direction though only of slight degree.

Among four residential orientations analyzed only the importance of a house and the neighborhood followed the predicted pattern. These two patterns seem to follow more directly from the hypothesized framework without being confounded with universal values such as occupational and educational orientation elements.

The analysis of data relating to the delay of gratification raises more questions than it answers. The behavioristic measures used generally fail to support the suggested framework. However, the secondary data showing the patterns of stayers behavior over the first eighteen months coincides with our expectations. The trend toward higher educational desires, the greater percentages of respondents attempting to save money, and the tendency to visit the supply area near holidays all give added weight to our framework.

In spite of numerous limitations, this analysis provides a beginning for extensive analysis. It appears possible to use value orientations as predictors of success in rural-urban migration. More extensive analyses are called for testing the utility of other value schemes as predictive measures. The time has come for students of rural-urban migration to use the theoretical tools available to us for sound analysis.

References

Brown, James S., Harry K. Schwarzweller and Joseph J. Mangalam
1963 "Kentucky mountain migration and the stem family: an American variation on a theme by Le Play." Rural Sociology 28 (March): 48 - 69.

Dunsavage, Evelyn and Michael Kleibrink
1970 "The relationship of aspirations and expectations to values: a conceptual analysis." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, Washington D. C., August 28.

Dynes, Russell
1956 "Level of occupational aspirations: some aspects of family experience as a variable." American Sociological Review 21 (April): 212 - 215.

Fliegel, Frederick C.
1959 "Aspirations of low-income farmers and their performance and potential for change." Rural Sociology 24 (September): 205 - 214.

Graves, T. D. and Minor Van Arsdale
1966 "Values, expectations, and relocation: the Navaho migrant to Denver." Human Organization 25 (Winter): 300 - 307.

Hyman, Herbert H.
1963 "The value systems of different classes: a social psychological contribution to the analysis of stratification." New York: The Free Press. Class, Status and Power: A Reader in Social Stratification. Bendix and Lipset (ed.).

Killian, Lewis M.
1953 "The adjustment of southern white migrants to northern urban norms." Social Forces 32: 66 - 69.

Kuvlesky, William P. and Robert C. Bealer
1966 "A clarification of the concept 'occupational choice'." Rural Sociology 31 (September): 265 - 276.

Kuvlesky, William P. and Victoria Patella
1970 "Strength of ethnic identification and intergenerational mobility aspirations among Mexican-American youth." Paper presented at the Southwestern Sociological Association meetings in Dallas, March 26 - 28.

McClelland, David C.
1961 "The Achieving Society. New York: The Free Press.

Maitland, Sheridan T. and Stanley M. Knebel
1968 "Rural to urban transition." Monthly Labor Review 91 (June): 28 - 52.

Merton, Robert K.
1968 Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press.

Moss, Joel J.
1956 "Newcomer family acceptance-rejection of the community and the process of assimilation." Rural Sociology 21 (September): 302 - 306.

Parsons, Talcott
1951 The Social System. New York: The Free Press.

Reissman, Leonard
1953 "Levels of aspiration and social class." American Sociological Review 18 (June): 233 - 242.

Rutman, Gilbert L.
1-70 "Migration and economic opportunities in West Virginia: a statistical analysis." Rural Sociology 35 (June): 206 - 217.

Schwarzweller, Harry K. and John F. Seggar
1967 "Kinship involvement: a factor in the adjustment of rural migrants." Journal of Marriage and the Family 29 (November): 662 - 67.